

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/769,105	Applicant(s) WALCOME, RICHARD OSCAR	
	Examiner Robert May	Art Unit 2875	

All Participants:

(1) Robert May.

(2) David L. Garrison.

Date of Interview: 9 November 2005

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
6, 11, 17, 8, 18, 22, 9, 14, 19

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.


☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 12:30PM



 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Regarding Claims 6,11,&17 , the attorney clarified that reference number 13 was added to Figure 7 which points to "a raised sealing portion" of the spigot and the attorney authorized the examiner to make amendment adding "13" to the spec on Pg 18, Para [0075] Line 2 to clarify antecedent basis in the spec. The examiner also requested that Figure 8 be amended to insert reference no. 13 so that it correctly points to the claimed element.

Regarding Claims 8,18,&22, the attorney clarified that added reference number 82 points to "hinge ears" and authorized examiner's amendment to add "82" to the spec where "hinge ears" are recited.

Regarding Claims 9,14,&19 the attorney clarified that "63" was added to Figure 4 which points to "a lip extending into the interior at one end" for the hollow latch tube as claimed. .